

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

LATRIVIA E. HARRIS,

Plaintiff,

v.

SACRAMENTO POLICE
DEPARTMENT,

Defendant.

Case No. 2:25-cv-01398-TLN-JDP

ORDER

This matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302. On August 22, 2025, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations herein which were served on the parties and which contained notice that any objections to the findings and recommendations were to be filed within fourteen days. No objections were filed.¹

The court presumes that any findings of fact are correct. *See Orand v. United States*, 602 F.2d 207, 208 (9th Cir. 1979). The magistrate judge's conclusions of law are reviewed de novo. *See Robbins v. Carey*, 481 F.3d 1143, 1147 (9th Cir. 2007) ("[D]eterminations of law by the

¹ Although it appears from the file that Plaintiff Latrivia E. Harris's ("Plaintiff") copy of the findings and recommendations was returned, Plaintiff was properly served. It is the Plaintiff's responsibility to keep the Court apprised of her current address at all times. Pursuant to Local Rule 182(f), service of documents at the record address of the party is fully effective.

1 magistrate judge are reviewed de novo by both the district court and [the appellate] court . . . ”).
2 Having reviewed the file, the Court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by
3 the record and by the proper analysis.

4 Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that:

5 1. The findings and recommendations filed August 22, 2025 (ECF No. 5) are adopted in
6 full.

7 2. This action is dismissed without prejudice for failure to prosecute, failure to comply
8 with court orders, and failure to state a claim for the reasons set forth in the court’s May 23, 2025
9 order. *See* ECF No. 3.

10 3. The Clerk of Court is directed to close the case.

11 IT IS SO ORDERED.

12 Date: September 26, 2025

13
14
15
16 
17 TROY L. NUNLEY
18 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28